

MS#160297.1 (MSFT 4936)
PATENT**REMARKS**

Applicant has thoroughly considered the Examiner's remarks and has amended the application in light thereof. The specification has been amended to correct minor typographical errors. Claims 1-51 are presented in the application for further examination. Claims 1-4, 9, 11, 13, 16, 20-22, 24, 27, 32, 34, 35-36, 41, 43 and 50 have been amended and claim 51 has been added by this Amendment A. Reconsideration of the application as amended and in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested. The following remarks will follow the sequence of the Office action.

Upon review of the specification and claims, Applicant notices minor typographical errors in the detailed description and claims 32 and 34. No new matter has been added by this amendment.

Claim Objections

Claims 20, 22, and 27 have been amended in light of the Examiner's objections. Applicant has corrected the proper terms and grammatical errors as indicated in the Examiner's objections. Therefore, objections to these claims should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2

Claims 16 and 50 stand rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2. Applicant has amended claims 16 and 50 in light of Examiner's rejection as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 16 has been amended to clarify the invention to allow a user to convert the scope window, the first primary display window, in conjunction with or in disjunction with, the second primary display window from one window type to another window type. Claim 50 has been amended to properly identify the antecedent of "first primary display window" in claim 48, as well as to correct a typographical error by replacing the term "users" with "user". Therefore, the rejections for claims 16 and 50 should be withdrawn.

MS#160297.1 (MSFT 4936)
PATENT**Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b)**

Claims 1-4, 8, 14-17, 21, 27, 30 and 44-46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Malamud et al., US Patent No. 5,694,561 ("Malamud patent") on page 4 of the Office Action.

Claims 1, 21, 27, and 44 are independent claims, and claims 2-4, 8, and 14-17 depend from independent claim 1; and claims 45-46 depend from independent claim 44. Applicant does not understand why claim 28 was not rejected, while claim 30 was rejected which depends from claim 28.

The Examiner argues that the Malamud patent discloses in Figure 2 and in various parts of the specification that a computer readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing a method comprising: 1. forming a scope window...; 2. forming a first primary display window...; and 3. forming a second primary display window ... wherein the second primary objects displayed by the second primary display window are independent of the first primary objects. The Examiner further argues that "it is inherent that the individual windows in a project group are independent of each other because they each have a separate link to the scope window and can be opened and closed individually." Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner as it appears that the Examiner misunderstands claim 1 as reciting a window independency between the first primary display window, the second primary display window and the scope window. Applicant requests that the Examiner cites to a reference to support the argument that such is inherent or withdraw the rejection. In addition, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation of window 201 as the scope window, window 203 as the first primary display window and window 207 as the second primary display window in Fig. 2 of the Malamud patent. Both points will be addressed below.

Claim 1 of the application, in pertinent parts, recites that "forming a second primary display window displaying one or more second primary objects linked to the scope window wherein the second primary objects displayed by the second primary display window are independent of the first primary objects displayed by the first primary display window." This claim recites that the second primary objects in the second primary display window are independent of the first primary objects in the first primary display window. It is not the windows that are linked individually. Rather, it is the objects within the first and second primary

MS#160297.1 (MSFT 4936)
PATENT

display windows that are independent of each other. This feature is also evident in the specification on lines 6-7 on page 3 of the application. This object-independency is desirable because, as discussed in the specification, it allows manipulation of the objects in various primary display windows to meet different users' needs in processing or operating the same set of objects.

As discussed in the specification (p. 14-15) of the pending application, the means for linking the first primary display windows to the scope window is independent of the means for linking the second primary display window to the scope window. In other words, if the first primary window is linked to the scope window in response to a user's selection of a scope item, the second primary display window may be linked to the scope window by a means other than a user's selection of the scope item (ll. 16-19, p. 14). For example, the means for linking the second primary window may be a user's customized or pre-set command to display a real time performance graph of information related to the selected scope item or a timed instruction set by an administrator, without the user's input, to display a report on the selected scope item.

Also, the Examiner refers to Fig. 2 of the Malamud patent to show a Mineral Project group window 201 with three other windows 203, 207 and 208 displaying contents of three of the objects in the Mineral Project Group window 201. It appears that the Examiner interprets that window 201 as the scope window, window 203 as the first primary display window and window 207 as the second primary display window. On the other hand, the specification of the pending application discloses that both the first primary display window and the second primary display window are driven by the same selected scope item in the scope window. First, window 201 of Fig. 2 of the Malamud patent should not be interpreted as a scope window because it fails to provide a drill-down tree structure of the entire tree. Second, one may interpret window 203 to be a first primary display window, but window 207 may not be interpreted as a second primary display window since different objects, i.e. "Quartz" and "Pyrite", drive windows 203 and 207, respectively. The specification of the pending application discloses that both the first and second primary display windows are driven by the same object, e.g. using Fig. 2 of the Malamud patent as an illustration, if window 207 were driven by "Quartz", it could be interpreted as a second primary display window. Third, the Malamud patent fails to teach or suggest there are independent links between the objects in windows 203 and 207 and window 201. Finally, the Malamud patent fails to teach or suggest that the links between the objects in

MS#160297.1 (MSFT 4936)
PATENT

windows 203 and 207 and window 201 are dynamic. In fact, the Malamud patent teaches that the links between the objects in windows 203 and 207 are coded, i.e. hardcoded, and are not allowed to be altered by the users (ll. 41-47, Col. 8; ll. 3-15, Col. 9). The present invention, on the other hand, attempts to solve the problem created by such prior art as the Malamud patent. The pending application discloses the content of windows, the placement of windows and the relationship between the windows may be dynamically linked and be created, defined and controlled by users or administrators. (Application, ll. 25-27, p. 1.)

Claim 1 has been amended to indicate that the forming of the first and second primary windows is in response to the same selected scope item in the scope window. Applicant submits that claim 1 should be allowable in light of the amendments. The remaining claims which depend from the above-noted independent claims are patentable for the same reasons as noted above with regard to the independent claims. In addition, it is submitted that the dependent claims individually recite features which in combination with the features of the independent claims are also patentable. Therefore, rejections for these claims should be withdrawn.

The Examiner further rejects claims 21, 27, 30, 44-46 for the same reason as those in claim 1. Similarly, Applicant has amended these claims to clarify the invention. Therefore, Applicant submits that these claims are in condition for allowance after the amendment and requests the rejections for these claims be withdrawn.

Claims 41-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Miklos, US Patent No. 5,226,117 ("Miklos patent") on page 9 of the Office action. Claims 42 and 43 depend from independent claim 41 and Applicant will address claim 41 in detail. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner. It appears that the Examiner misunderstands the claims and misinterprets the Miklos patent.

The Examiner argues that the Miklos patent teaches all four elements of claim 41. In particular, referring to figure 2 of the Miklos patent, the Examiner interprets the Directory window 100 as a scope window; the FRIENDS nickname list window 40 as a first primary display window; and the DEPARTMENT 6BM window 50 as a first secondary window and that windows 40 and 50 "communicates" with window 100 when elements in windows 40 and 50 are updated in window 100.

MS#160297.1 (MSFT 4936)
PATENT

It appears that the Examiner misunderstands the pending application. First, the directory window 100 in the Miklos patent should not be interpreted as a scope window because window 100 fails to provide a drill-down hierarchical display of the items within the scope window. A drill-down display is desirable, as described in the pending application, because it allows a user to navigate to the desired item or object in the hierarchy without confusion. According to the application, after opening a first primary display window, a user selects a first primary object in the first primary display window. In response to the user's selection, a first secondary display window is opened and the user selects a first secondary object in the first secondary display window. This selection results in a communication between the first secondary display window and the scope window such that the focus changes to the selected first secondary object in the scope window. In other words, the scope window is not static in terms of display and navigation as taught by the Miklos patent. In fact, the Miklos patent teaches away or does not suggest this dynamic feature as presented in the invention.

According to the Miklos patent, figure 4 shows the result of an action by a user (in this case, it was a deletion command). The figure 4 shows that window 30 is "focused" (with a dotted border around the window 30) after the completion of deletion, but the selected item in the DEPARTMENT 6BM window 50 is not focused in the DIRECTORY window 100. In fact, the selected items (61, 63) before executing deletion command did not trigger any response in terms of display in the DIRECTORY window 100. Also, the Miklos patent teaches that DIRECTORY window 100 will be updated when elements 61 and 63 in window 40 are updated. (ll. 28-31, col. 5). However, the pending application discloses that there is an independent communication between the selected secondary object and the scope window such that the focus of the scope window changes dynamically with the selection or command in the first secondary display window. In addition, the link between the objects in the first secondary display window may be altered by a user or an administrator to meet its needs. The Miklos patent fails to teach or suggest this feature.

With the above explanation, Applicant has amended claims 41 and 43 to further clarify the invention. Therefore, Applicant submits these claims are in condition for allowance. Claims 42-43, which depend from claim 41, are patentable for the same reasons as independent claim 41. In addition, it is submitted that the dependent claims individually recite features which in

MS#160297.1 (MSFT 4936)
PATENT

combination with the features of independent claim 41 are also patentable. Therefore, rejections for claims 41-43 should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Malamud patent in view of the Miklos patent on page 11 of the Office action.

The Examiner argues that the Miklos patent teaches "a first secondary display window displaying first secondary objects linked to the first primary display window; and linking the first secondary display window to the scope window so that a command or selection in the first secondary display window changes the focus or content of the scope window." Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the Miklos patent with the Malamud patent. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation of these two patents.

The Examiner acknowledges that the Malamud patent fails to teach the computer-readable medium of claim 1. As explained above, the Miklos patent, while updating the directory window 100 when items 61 and 63 are been updated, fails to teach an independent link between the selected secondary object in the first secondary display window and the scope window such that the selected secondary object will be displayed and focused in the scope window. In addition, Applicant has amended claim 1 to clarify this feature.

Therefore, since claims 5 to 7 depend from claim 1 and Applicant believes claim 1 as amended is in condition for allowance, the rejection for claims 5 to 7 should be withdrawn.

Claims 9-13, 18-20, 22-26, 28, and 31-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Malamud patent in view of Ku, et al., US Patent No. 6,421,072 ("Ku patent") on page 14 of the Office action. Claims 9-13 depend from claim 1; claims 19-20, and 22-26 depend from claim 18; claims 31-34 depend from claim 28; claims 36-37 depend from claim 35; and claims 39-40 depend from claim 38. The Examiner argues that various claims of the pending application read on the Ku patent. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's reading and argues that the combined reference teachings fail to teach what is

MS#160297.1 (MSFT 4936)
PATENT

claimed in the application. As such, Applicant will address the Examiner's arguments against the independent claims in totality.

Referring to the above discussion of claim 1, as amended, the second primary display window is driven by the same selected scope item as the first primary display window. Therefore, the Examiner's argument that "it is inherent that node 350 can have a new window created that contains a sub-tree with node 350 as the root node and a visual link to the parent node of node 350, node 340, displayed in window 315" is inaccurate. Applicant requests that the Examiner cites to a reference to support the argument that such is inherent or withdraw the rejection.

For illustration purposes and using the Ku patent as an example, in order for the Ku patent to be applicable, a second primary display window would be a new window displaying the same objects as the window 315 shown in figure 3 of the Ku patent. In contrast, according to the pending application, the objects in the second primary display window are independent from the objects in a window such as window 315 even though each window displays the same objects. This feature is desirable, according to the application, because it allows different manipulation of the same data at the same time by different users to meet their needs. At the same time, the window 310 (the Examiner interprets this as the scope window according to the application) would still display the objects that are in window 315 in window 310. Hence, window 310 would still maintain the overall structure in the hierarchy.

The Ku patent specifically teaches away from this feature as it attempts to create a sub-tree structure from window 310. (ll. 1-3, col. 5). Furthermore, referring now to figure 4 of the Ku patent, as the Examiner interprets window 420 as a first secondary display window, object 462 would be considered as a first secondary object in window 420. However, the Ku patent fails to teach that there is a link between object 462 and window 410 such that a selection of object 462 would focus the selected item, object 462, in window 410. Object 462 is not visible in window 410 and therefore there could not be a link between object 462 and window 410 in window 410.

Even if one would combine the teachings in the Malamud patent and the Ku patent, one would still not be able to achieve the claims. Hence, Applicant submits that the Examiner fails to establish the prima facie elements of a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103. In addition, Applicant has amended claims 1-4, 16, 21, 27, 35, 36 and 43 in response to the rejection. Claim 51 has

MS#160297.1 (MSFT 4936)
PATENT

been added to clarify independent linking of claim 35. The remaining claims in this rejection which depend from the above-noted independent claims are patentable for the same reasons as independent claims. In addition, it is submitted that the dependent claims individually recite features which in combination with the features of independent claims are also patentable. Therefore, Applicant believes claims 9-13, 18-20, 22-26, 28, and 31-40 are in condition for allowance and request the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 29 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Malamud patent in view of the Ku patent as applied to claim 28 above further in view of the Miklos patent on page 21 of the Office action. Claim 29 depends from and further limits claim independent 28. Therefore, Applicant will address claims 28 and 29 in response to this rejection. The Examiner argues that "it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Miklos with the computer-readable medium of Malamud and Ku in order to allow concurrent entry and manipulation of data within parent and child windows of the same application." Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's reading of these three patents and argues the Examiner fails to establish the prima facie elements of a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claim 28 recites "linking the first primary objects to the selected scope item in accordance with instructions from the user or administrator; and linking the second primary objects to the selected scope item in accordance with instructions from the user or administrator wherein the step of linking the second primary objects is independent of the step of linking the first primary objects." Claim 29 further limits claim 28 by reciting "wherein the linking between the first primary objects and the scope window is defined by an application developer or a user so that parameters are passed from the scope window to the first primary display window and wherein the passed parameters are used in a query to control the display of the first primary objects in the first primary display window." Applicant argues that the Miklos patent fails to teach or suggest that linking the secondary primary objects is independent of linking the first primary objects and that the passed parameters are used in a query to control the display of the first primary objects in the first primary display window. Therefore, even if one would combine the three cited references, the combined teaching would still not teach or suggest the features of claim 28 or 29.

MS#160297.1 (MSFT 4936)
PATENT

The Miklos patent teaches "the memory also stores code which controls the automatic updating of the related windows in the multiwindowing environment." (ll. 23-26, col. 2). The Miklos patent teaches the memory stores code that controls automatic updating of the related windows. This teachings of "hardcoding" of the linkage between the scope window and first and second primary windows teaches away from independent links from the first and second primary display windows to the scope window, according to the invention. Claims 28 and 29 emphasize these features as underlined above.

Therefore, with the above explanation, the Examiner fails to establish the prima facie elements of a rejection of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and the rejection for claim 29 should be withdrawn.

Claims 47-49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Malamud patent in view of the Brooks patent on page 22 of the Office action. Claims 48 and 49 depend from and further limit independent claim 47 which will be discussed below. The Examiner argues that "it would be obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Brooks with the method of Malamud in order to allow multiple windows to be viewed on the same level, without the time consuming process of having to resize and position multiple windows." It appears that the Examiner has misinterpreted the Brooks patent and thus has failed to establish the prima facie elements of a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The Brooks patent teaches a use of a dynamic window (Fig. 4) and placing other windows into the dynamic window in order to resize and position multiple windows. The current application fails to require such a creation of the dynamic window. Instead, claim 47 of the pending application recites that "a first primary display window displaying first primary objects linked to the scope window and having an edge adjacent an edge of the scope window; and a second primary display window displaying second primary objects linked to the scope window and having an edge adjacent to an edge of the scope window or an edge of the primary window wherein adjacent edges are docked to each other so that movement of one adjacent edge causes movement of the other adjacent edge." That is, the scope window, the first primary display window and the second primary display window alone accomplishes what the Brooks patent claims to teach with the addition of a dynamic window. Furthermore, even if one would combine the two references, the combined teaching would still fail to teach that the different

MS#160297.1 (MSFT 4936)
PATENT

windows incorporate this feature of dynamic resizing and positioning without a need of a dynamic window as required by the Brooks patent.

Hence, with the forgoing, Applicant argues that the Examiner fails to establish the prima facie elements of a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Therefore, the rejection for claim 47 should be withdrawn. Since claims 48 and 49 further limit claim 47 and Applicant feels arguments above apply to these dependent claims, the rejections for claims 48 and 49 should also be withdrawn.

Claim 50 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Malamud patent in view of the Brooks patent as applied to claim 28 above further in view of the Ku patent on page 25 of the Office action. Claim 50, which depends from claim 47, is patentable for the same reasons as claim 47. In addition, it is submitted that the dependent claim individually recites features which in combination with the features of independent claims 47 are also patentable. Therefore, rejections for claim 50 should be withdrawn.

It is felt that a full and complete response has been made to the Office action and, as such, places the application in condition for allowance. Such allowance is hereby respectfully requested. If the Examiner feels, for any reason, that a personal interview will expedite the prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Applicant does not believe that a fee is due. If, however, the Commissioner determines otherwise, such fees may be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-1345.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert M. Bain, Reg. No. 36,736
SENNIGER, POWERS, LEAVITT & ROEDEL
One Metropolitan Square, 16th Floor
St. Louis, Missouri 63102
(314) 231-5400

FRA/ATY/cjl